



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,439	11/16/2000	Shelton Louie	1205-002/JRD	5706

21034 7590 05/15/2003

IPSOLON LLP  
805 SW BROADWAY, #2740  
PORTLAND, OR 97205

EXAMINER

JAKETIC, BRYAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/715,439

Applicant(s)

LOUIE ET AL.

Examiner

Bryan Jaketic

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-7 and 9-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denenberg et al in view of Engellenner. Denenberg et al disclose a method for tracking prescription orders through a retail pharmacy having a plurality of spaced apart locations comprising the steps of receiving the prescription order at a first location (col. 9, lines 64 through col. 10, line 4); entering data into a computer system at a second location (16); tagging a carrier of the prescription order with a barcode (col. 6, lines 30-38); manually storing the filled prescription at one of a plurality of storage locations having a plurality of cubbies (14, 18, 20); automatically detecting the prescription order at one of the plurality of storage locations with a barcode reader (col. 8, lines 46-50); recording the location of the prescription order (col. 6, lines 39-47); and displaying the location on a computer display (col. 13, lines 27-47).

Denenberg et al further disclose the steps of automatically collecting timing information, storing the timing information, and compiling workflow information based on the timing information (col. 16, lines 1-43). A worker can be automatically signaled when the prescription order exceeds a predetermined amount of time (col. 16, lines 30-43). The workflow information may be associated with a particular worker to evaluate worker efficiency (col. 16, lines 2-5).

Denenberg et al do not disclose a tag that is detachably secure to the prescription order or that is rigidly secured to the prescription. However, detachable and rigidly secure tags are both common in the art, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a rigidly secured tag with the invention of Denenberg et al to ensure that the tags aren't mistakenly lost. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a detachable tag with the invention of Denenberg et al, so that the tags may be re-used.

Denenberg et al also fail to disclose a tag reader for each cubby. Engellenner discloses an RFID tag and tag reader (see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 46-65) for locating items. Engellenner teaches that the receivers automatically detect when tagged items are placed in or removed from a specific region (col. 3, lines 40-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the tag and tag reader of Engellenner in each cubby of the invention of Denenberg et al, because the tag reader of Engellenner can interrogate each spatial region automatically.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denenberg et al and Engellenner as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pilarczyk. Denenberg et al and Engellenner disclose all of the limitations of the claim except for a teaching of notifying a pharmacy worker if a refill prescription has been prematurely submitted. Pilarczyk discloses a system for prescription compliance that notifies a worker if a refill has been submitted prematurely (col. 10, lines 5-28). It would

Art Unit: 3627

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Pilarczyk with the invention of Denenberg et al so that a pharmacist may make note of premature refills.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 17 March 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Denenberg et al is limited to will-call storage entry and egress. Examiner concedes that Denenberg et al do not expressly teach the steps of tracking a prescription order within a pharmacy upstream of a storage device. However, the claimed invention is not limited to such an embodiment, and Examiner maintains that Denenberg et al meet the prescription tracking system that is presently claimed.

Applicant also argues that Denenberg et al do not disclose the step of tracking worker efficiency. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Column 16 of Denenberg et al disclose the collection of workflow and worker efficiency information. Denenberg et al specifically mentions monitoring the performance of pharmacy personnel in col. 16, lines 4-5.

Applicant also argues that Denenberg et al do not disclose an automatic tracking system. Examiner concedes this point. However, Engellenner discloses an automatic tracking system that utilizes RFID tags to determine the presence of an item in a spatial region. Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3627

the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Engellenner with the invention of Denenberg et al to provide automatic tracking.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan Jaketic whose telephone number is (703) 308-0134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cuff can be reached on (703) 308-0610. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 3627

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

bj  
May 12, 2003

*Michael Cuff* 5/14/03  
MICHAEL CUFF  
PRIMARY EXAMINER